THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

25 October 1990

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

19 September 1990

B. Dates of next meetings:

13 December 1990
17 January 1991

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Treasury, U.S. Mint

CFA 25/Oct/90-1, Mount Rushmore Commemorative Coins. Designs.

B. Department of State, International Center

CFA 25/Oct/90-2, Government of Singapore. Preliminary design for new chancery.

C. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 25/Oct/90-3, White House Precinct. Treatment of public sidewalks. Restudy. (Previous: CFA 16/Jul/90-4.)

D. General Services Administration

CFA 25/Oct/90-11, Internal Revenue Service Building, Federal Triangle, next to Old Post Office Building. Preliminary design for completing the unfinished building ends.

E. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 25/Oct/90-4, Hirshhorn Museum, Independence Avenue at 7th and 9th Streets, N.W. Plaza renovation, final paving and landscaping. (Previous: CFA 19/Oct/89-1.)

2. CFA 25/Oct/90-5, Quadrangle repaving between Smithsonian Castle and Independence Avenue, N.W. Design.

F. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

CFA 25/Oct/90-6, Metro Archives Station. Flood protection for ventilators.

G. Department of the Army, US Army Corps of Engineers

1. CFA 25/Oct/90-7, Soldiers and Airmens Home, 3700 North Capitol Street, N.W. Renovation.

2. CFA 25/Oct/90-8, Magnetic Resonance Imaging Facility (MRI), Walter Reed Medical Center. Addition to existing hospital building. Revised design alternatives. (Previous: CFA 26/Jul/90-3, 21/Jun/90-6.)

3. CFA 25/Oct/90-9, Walter Reed Medical Center. Landscape plan for multi-level parking structure. (Previous: CFA 19/Sept/90-3, CFA 15/Nov/89-2.)

H. The Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and The Virginia Railway Express

CFA 25/Oct/90-10, Station Platform, Virginia Avenue and 7th Street, S.W. Design for new passenger facility.

I. Department of the Army, Institute of Heraldry

CFA 25/Oct/90-12, Maritime Administration; seven medal designs.

J. Navy Memorial Foundation

CFA 25/Oct/90-13, Bas-relief for Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N.W. (Previous: CFA 19/Sept/90-2, CFA 15/Feb/90-1, CFA 20/Apr/89-4, CFA 19/May/88-1.)

K. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 90-106, 1263-65 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Commercial underground addition. Revised concept. (Previous: 19/Sept/90, 17/May/90.)

b. Appendix II.

Discussion item not on agenda: East German Embassy - see p. 4 of minutes.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 90-203 HPA. 90-898	200 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Chevron U.S.A. Gas station	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed non-illuminated decal sign for service station.

S.L. 90-204	2112 F Street, N.W. Robert Wolpe PMI Parking	Sign - permit

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed vertical sign on pier of building. Recommend free standing horizontal sign located in landscape area next to driveway.

S.L. 90-206 HPA. 90-902	1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Riggs National Bank	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign consisting of non-illuminated, pin-mounted, gold-leafed aluminum letters.

S.L. 90-207	38 G Street, S.W. Phyllis McGovern Residence	Enclosure of roof terrace - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed enclosure of roof terrace.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* S.L. 90-208	1750 Poplar Lane, N.W. Norman Mayfield New single family dwelling	New building - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new single family dwelling. Working drawings conform to previously approved concept submission. See previous Action (S.L. 90-172). Request sample of brick for review prior to construction of walls.

S.L. 90-209 HPA. 90-915	201 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Capitol Hill East/West Condo. Residential/commercial	Replace windows - permit

ACTION: Recommend <u>against</u> issuance of permit. Proposed design of new thermopane windows is detrimental to character of historic building. Recommend study of alternative designs for replacement windows.

S.L. 90-210 HPA. 90-920	301 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Douglas Development Commercial	Exterior alterations - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to exterior of building as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 October 1990. Recommend separate submission of <u>non-illuminated</u> sign for review.

S.L. 91-01	7417 16th Street, N.W. Dr. Etienne Massac Residence	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed fence. Recommend fence be painted white.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 91-02 HPA. 90-933	2204 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. Louise Wiener Residence	Alterations to rear - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations which are already under way.

S.L. 91-04 HPA. 91-12	235 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Lola Revither Commercial	Replacement of roof - permit

ACTION: Recommend issuance of permit for replacement in-kind (slate) or standing seam metal roof painted to match slate color ONLY. Recommend against proposed replacement of roof with asphalt shingles.

S.L. 91-07	1709 New York Avenue, N.W. Melvin Lenkin Office building	Access ramp - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed access ramp. Every effort should be made to maintain as much of the existing landscape as possible.

S.L. 91-09	400 C Street, N.W. USIA Building Hardee's	Replacement signs - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement signs.

S.L. 91-12	2801 Rock Creek Drive, N.W. J. K. Cooke Residence	Pool house and pool - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed pool and pool house.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 91-13	516 North Capitol Street, N.W. MRO Mid Atlantic Inc. Hardee's	Sign and canopy - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed backlighted sign and resurfacing of existing canopy with letters limited to valance.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-159 HPA. 90-782	3130 M Street, N.W. Express Development Restaurant/office building	Rear addition alterations to front - revised concept

ACTION: No objection to concept of rear addition and alterations to front facade. Recommend reducing width of proposed lunette facing alley and refining detailing at street entrance to more closely reflect the existing second story. Submit working drawings for permit review when ready.

O.G. 90-170 HPA. 90-831	2725 N Street, N.W. Richard Green Residence	Two-story rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed two-story rear addition. Working drawings conform to previously approved concept (see Action O.G. 90-104).

O.G. 90-172 HPA. 90-834	1229 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Merry-Go-Round Boogies Diner	Signs and awnings - revised concept

ACTION: No objection to concept for proposed non-illuminated awning with valance lettering or to paired menu boxes as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 20 September 1990. Submit working drawings and material samples for permit review when ready.

O.G. 90-177 HPA. 90-868	3275 M Street, N.W. F. Moussa and R. Roushdy Subway (sandwich shop)	Awning - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for shed-type awning with lettering on valance over entrance ONLY. Applicant has agreed to eliminate awning lighting and to use brown vinyl covering with yellow lettering.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-178 HPA. 90-872	2615 P Street, N.W. J. Mula and D. Doyle Country Antiques	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for existing sign.

O.G. 90-182 HPA. 90-909	3327 Dent Place, N.W. David Labovitz Residence	Parking pad and alterations - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed parking space off alley as shown in working drawings which conform to previous recommendations of Commission (see Action O.G. 90-173).

O.G. 90-184 HPA. 90-110	1251 Bank Street, N.W. 3307 M Street Partners Phase II/mixed use building	Residential addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed Phase II residential addition to commercial office-retail project currently under construction. Working drawings conform to previous concept design approval and Commission recommendations which included articulating the garage entrance cheek walls, reducing the apparent bulk of the structure by altering the mix of materials, eliminating the Victorian bay window, and providing both a sidewalk at the building front and plant material at the north alley retaining wall. The new brick that is to be used to articulate certain features is also approved. (See O.G. 90-118.)

O.G. 90-185 HPA. 90-911	1531 26th Street, N.W. Edward E. Brighton, Jr. Residence	Paving of driveway - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed brick apron at sidewalk to match width of existing gate to parking pad.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-186	1354 27th Street, N.W. Joan Salop Residence	Alterations to rear of roof - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of alterations to rear of roof to include dormer and balcony. Side walls of dormer are to match roofing. Also, architect has agreed to reduce "heaviness" in the appearance of the balcony.

PRE-MEETING TOUR OF PROJECT SITES - 25 OCTOBER 1990

CONVENE: 8:00 AM
Pension Building, Suite 312, 441 F Street, N.W.

1. Whitehouse area sidewalks, 15th and E Streets, N.W.

2. Smithsonian Quadrangle, 8th and Independence Avenue, N.W.

3. Station platform site, 7th and Virginia Avenue, S.W.

4. Metro vent site, 7th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Members Present:

J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Neil H. Porterfield, Vice Chairman
Joan Abrahamson
Adele Chatfield-Taylor
George Hartman
Robert Peck

Staff Present:

Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

25 October 1990

The meeting was convened at 10:05 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., after a tour of project sites.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Neil J. Porterfield, Vice Chairman Hon. Joan Abrahamson Hon. Adele Chatfield-Taylor Hon. George E. Hartman Hon. Robert A. Peck
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Patrick Tribe Ms. Margot Stephenson

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the minutes of the 19 September 1990 meeting. Mr. Peck pointed out a typographical error, which will be corrected when the minutes are printed in final form. Otherwise, they were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings. The dates of the next meetings were confirmed as:
13 December 1990
17 January 1991

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Department of the Treasury, United States Mint

CFA 25/OCT/90-1, Mount Rushmore Commemorative Coins. Designs. Staff member Sue Kohler introduced this submission, noting the presence of the Deputy Director of the Mint, Eugene Essner, and commenting that this was the first of what promised to be quite a few commemorative coin submissions during the coming year.

She said the legislation provided for three coins: a five dollar gold coin, one dollar silver coin, and a half dollar clad coin. The legislation also stated that the designs were to be approved by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society and the Commission of Fine Arts. She said the Mint had held a limited competition for the designs, had made a preliminary selection, and received approval of those designs from the Mount Rushmore Society. She showed the designs to the members and introduced Mr. Essner to make comments and answer questions.

Mr. Essner said the Mount Rushnore Society had requested several minor changes: they did not like the depiction of the State of Utah within the map of the United States on the reverse of the one dollar coin, because of the national character of the memorial, and they preferred the use of the words "Shrine of Democracy" rather than "National Shrine" because of the religious connotation of the latter. On the reverse of the half dollar, they did not like the term "50th Year Anniversary". Mr. Essner said the Mint would suggest to the Secretary of the Treasury that these words be eliminated, since the obverse already used the term "Mount Rushmore Golden Anniversary"; then the bison used as part of the design could be moved up and made more central to the composition. Mr. Hartman asked if both sides of the coins had been done by the same artist; Mr. Essner said no, that in all cases the obverse and reverse were the work of different artists. Mr. Hartman said that was apparent in the one dollar and half dollar coins, especially in the two very different lettering styles used on the obverse and reverse of the one dollar coin. He said he thought it was very important that the lettering styles be compatible, and in this case the style used on the reverse was preferable. Mr. Essner said he realized such adjustments would have to be made.

Ms. Abrahamson brought up the obverse design for the half dollar coin, which depicted the four heads inside an outline map of the United States, and showed Alaska and Hawaii below. She said that in looking at the other competition designs, the members had found one that they thought would be better; it was designated J-1 and showed the heads in a better perspective view, without the map. She showed it to Mr. Essner. The members all agreed that the use of the map, and the addition of Hawaii and Alaska, floating in space, made for a weak design. Mr. Essner said the Mount Rushmore

Society had particularly liked the idea of placing the heads within the map, but the Mint would certainly consider the alternative design; he said the only problem with it was that there was only a small area that could be proofed, but that was something that could be studied, and perhaps minor revisions would solve the problem. The Chairman said he was bothered by another map--the one placed below the Great Seal on the obverse of the one dollar coin. He thought it should be eliminated, the Great Seal moved down somewhat, and the words "Shrine of Democracy" used instead of "National Shrine".

There was no further discussion; the Chairman told Mr. Essner that the designs in general were approved, with the comments and recommendations made, and asked that he work with the staff as adjustments were made to the individual designs. Exhibit A

B. Department of State, International Center

CFA 25/OCT/90-2, Government of Singapore. Preliminary design for new chancery. Staff member Jose Martinez pointed out the location for the new building: at the corner of Van Ness Street and International Drive East, near the Center's administration building, and across from the UDC campus. Herbert Johnson from the State Department was introduced, and he told the members that his department was particularly interested in the design of this chancery, since its location made it a gateway to the Center. He said they were pleased with the design, and especially with the landscaping, which was just what they wanted to see on that corner. Mr. Johnson then introduced Bernie Wall, from the architectural firm of RTKL, to make the presentation.

Mr. Wall said the most important view of the building would be from Connecticut Avenue, as it would establish the chancery as a gateway and reflect Singapore as a garden city, one of the two goals the government of Singapore had in mind for the design of the building. The other goal was to express the dynamism and excitement of the new Singapore. Mr. Wall said there was still a strong remnant of the British colonial past in Singapore's buildings, and he had tried to incorporate those elements that he thought appropriate to Washington.

Turning to the drawings and a model, Mr. Wall said the building would defer to the corner in its shape and embrace the garden, which he considered as important as the building itself. It would enclose about 55,000 square feet and provide 25 parking spaces underground. The over-hanging hipped roof and the large amount of window area echoed the traditional Singapore structures. He said the exterior material would be granite and the roof terne metal. Inside there would be a large amount of open space, with a two-story reception area and stair leading down to the garden level and a multi-purpose area. The upper floors would be devoted to office use with the ambassador's suite on the top floor.

HERBOTS

CFA 25 October 90-2
New Chancery of Singapore
International Center

Mr. Wall described the garden, which would be defined by a curved wall. The area outside the wall, but within the peripheral fence, would be heavily landscaped with trees, including flowering cherries, to act as a buffer to the busy street (Van Ness). Within the garden itself there would be azaleas and other appropriate plant material. A large specimen tree would be planted in a circular space in the garden area. Mr. Wall noted that the garden would be the first thing seen as one approached the site from Connecticut Avenue.

The members were all pleased with the design, considering it one of the best in the International Center, and it was approved unanimously. Mr. Peck then asked Mr. Johnson if he could tell the Commission what had happened to the plans for the East German embassy building. Mr. Johnson said the West Germans had asked to use the lot for an annex, but as that was against the policy of every agency involved, the request was disapproved and the ambassador had requested that his government formally return the lot to the State Department. Exhibit B

C. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 25/OCT/90-3, White House Precinct. Treatment of public sidewalks. Restudy. (Previous: CFA 16/JUL/90-4.) Staff member Jeffrey Carson recalled the Commission's review, in July, of plans for renovation of Sherman Park, and the questions about plans for the sidewalks around the entire White House precinct: between Pennsylvania and Constitution avenues and 15th and 17th streets. He noted that the members had toured the area prior to this meeting and had been briefed by landscape architect Carol Whipple of the Park Service. He introduced Ms. Whipple and asked her to continue her presentation, but before she spoke, James McDaniel, White House liaison for the Park Service, reviewed the work that had already been completed and the goals of the entire project.

Mr. McDaniel recalled that the Commission had first seen the plans for the improvement of the sidewalk areas around the President's Park in February 1987. He said some of the work was underway, and they hoped to get as much as possible completed by October 1992, the 200th anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the White House. He said they had two goals: to improve the safety and appearance of the sidewalks for the occupants of the house and for visitors; and to recreate the sense of unity the area had in the L'Enfant plan, a unity that had been partially lost by the erection of the Treasury, the OEOB, and the cutting through of E Street. He said he hoped that a uniform sidewalk paving pattern would provide a frame and help restore the sense of unity.

Ms. Whipple then showed detail drawings of the proposed paving patterns, first showing a sample of the three inch thick paver with

an exposed aggregate surface that was already in use. She said the Pennsylvania Avenue section was nearing completion, and the Park Service was seeking guidance now on how to treat the crosswalks and the southern perimeter of the precinct. She showed drawings and discussed the Sherman Park crosswalks at 15th Street, commenting on the problems with vendors, trash, and the need for appropriate signs to direct tourists to the White House tour entrances. She pointed out accent plantings at the park entrances.

Continuing to the corner of 15th Street and Constitution Avenue, she showed the plan for the treatment of the Bulfinch gatehouse, commenting that the gatehouse would be restored, paving placed around it so that it could be seen properly, and planting added to give it a more attractive setting and emphasize it as an entrance to the President's Park. She said the other Bulfinch gatehouse at 17th and Constitution would be treated in a similar fashion. She discussed the street tree planting, which would take into account what was in place on the other side of the street so that in maturity the trees would create a sense of promenade. Ms. Whipple then showed photos of various street furniture items; some evoked the period of the 1890s. Vice-Chairman Porterfield was critical of a concrete planter shown in one of the photos, commenting that it looked like those used in shopping malls. Ms. Whipple said that type of planter was temporary in nature, used only when traffic control was necessary. The design of another element, the drinking fountain, was singled out by both the Chairman and Mr. Hartman as being inappropriate. The next comment concerned the paving and the use of contrasting bands of pavers to disguise the awkward situation that occurred at crosswalks, where there was a change in direction. Mr. Hartman thought that could be solved by "mitering" the pavers around the curve and getting rid of the unattractive dividing lines; he noted that the District government had laid them in a similar fashion at the corner of 15th and E Street. He thought the banding was acceptable on Pennsylvania Avenue, where the sidewalks were wide and the scale of everything was large, but he did not think it should be used on the other streets. He thought the idea of consistency in the paving was good, but said the details must vary according to the location. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor observed that the banding tended to minimize the width of the sidewalk, which was not desirable, particularly on 17th Street. Vice-Chairman Porterfield urged that the striving for unity extend beyond the paving; he thought consideration should be given to the way the space was broken up by the cross streets, and to the effect the cars parked on these streets had on the sense of unity. Ms. Abrahamson agreed, saying that she was particularly disturbed by the cars parked between the Treasury and Sherman Park.

No formal action was required, but Mr. McDaniels said he was happy to hear the members' comments, and he thought it was an appropriate time to mention that, primarily because of the urging of the Commission, the Park Service now had in its budget a million

dollars to begin a long-range master plan for the White House and President's Park. Exhibit C

D. General Services Administration

CFA 25/OCT/90-11, Internal Revenue Service Building, Federal Triangle, next to Old Post Office Building. Preliminary design for completing the unfinished building ends. The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had been instrumental in bringing this project to fruition, and introduced architect Jerry Karn to make the presentation.

Mr. Karn said the yellow brick ends at 11th and 12th Street had remained in their unfinished condition for fifty years, but would finally be completed. The Chairman gave a brief history of the situation, noting that the IRS building had been left unfinished, pending the demolition of the Old Post Office building and the completion of the hemicycle feature of the Triangle. For many years no decision was made in regard to the Old Post Office; in the 1960s it was scheduled to be demolished under the PADC plan, but was saved through the efforts of Nancy Hanks and others. Then, it became apparent to the Commission that something finally had to be done about the unattractive building ends, and their completion was recommended when the Triangle master plan was reviewed in 1979.

Mr. Karn said there had been two guiding principles used in developing his preliminary designs: (1) to use the architectural forms existing on the IRS building but not to copy them exactly; and (2) to base the design on the knowledge that there are now different spatial and functional relationships between the IRS building and the Old Post Office. Mr. Karn noted the strong Romanesque design of the older building, the tightness of the space between the two that would result when the new facade was added to the IRS, and the presence of the new, glassy pavilion addition to the Old Post Office.

Beginning with the building end at 11th Street, Mr. Karn noted first that the street terminated at this point, and the new pavilion addition and the completion of the IRS facade were to be considered features of this termination point. He pointed out on a drawing that the IRS building had been completed on Pennsylvania Avenue to the first of two pilasters on the corner, and he would turn the corner as had been done elsewhere on the building, adding the second pilaster. As there would be an entrance in the new facade, he had provided a lobby, much like the 10th Street entrance, but the exterior would be more restrained, keeping the pediment but using pilasters rather than free-standing columns. He said he thought a repetition of the 10th Street entrance would be too strong and take up too much space; also, he would prefer not

CFA 25 October 90-11
Federal Triangle - Pa. Ave.
Completion of IRS Bldg.

to duplicate the 1920s design. He noted also that the new facade would be constructed so that it was parallel to the Old Post Office Building.

Mr. Peck thought it important that the new work be clearly differentiated from the old, that the point be made that the building was not intended to end this way, that the plan had been interrupted. Mr. Hartman said he agreed, but would make one change: he would not use the pediment but just continue the projecting section of the Pennsylvania Avenue facade with its cornice and pilasters around the corner. He thought that because of the cramped space, the pediment would be seen only from an extremely oblique view and would not be effective; also, it could have the appearance of "upstaging" the original Pennsylvania Avenue frontage. The Chairman said he did not think that frontage had any particular importance--it did not have an entrance--and he thought the architect had done such a sensitive job it would be better not to attempt to change it. Vice-Chairman Porterfield thought the pediment helped in that it announced an entrance into the building. Mr. Karn said his group had had many discussions about whether or not to use the pediment and understood what Mr. Hartman was saying. Mr. Hartman said he had not meant to imply that removing the pediment was a requirement, but he did think it would be helpful to look at it again. He told Mr. Karn that he was happy that he had not copied the 10th Street entrance, but hoped that when it came time to detail the pilasters and mouldings he would look at the old drawings and do it in the same way; Mr.Karn said he intended to do so.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor asked Mr. Karn about the treatment of the area between the new IRS facade and the Old Post Office building; she said it needed a lot of thought--particularly the semicircular stair entrance into the Old Post Office--and she recalled that the Commission had seen a design for it. Mr. Karn said they were continuing to work on modifications to the stairs and would be using the PADC pavers in the plaza area.

Mr. Karn then discussed the material for the new IRS facade. He said he wanted to be able to reproduce the stone with absolute accuracy, but it would be cut using present-day technology. Mr. Hartman did not think there would be any difficulty finding the stone.

Mr. Karn turned to his plan for finishing off the 12th Street facade of the IRS Building. He showed drawings, noting where the brick and limestone came together, and commented that in this case he had not been concerned with the treatment of a form, but with a simple finishing and cladding of a facade; he said the addition of the infill pavilion building would make the space very tight, and there was no room for creating a portico. In spite of the apparent simplicity of the task, there had been major problems: how to join the richly detailed hemicycle facade to a simple,

punched window facade that was never intended to meet it; how to deal with stone joints that did not line up; and what to do when a fenestration pattern dictated windows that would fall directly in front of an interior column. Mr. Karn showed drawings, pointing out how the slate and terra cotta roofs had been brought together and showing how he intended to treat the new facade. He said the joint problem had been mitigated by ending the 12th Street pattern in a hidden corner and bringing the plaza jointing around to meet it. The interior column problem had been solved by introducing blind windows.

The members were all pleased with Mr. Karn's plans, and after a brief discussion of where to end two mouldings on the 12th Street facade, they were unanimously approved. The Chairman said he hoped that at some point the competition-winning plan for treating the left-over space in the hemicycle (by Mr. Karn's former firm, Harry Weese Associates) could be implemented, so that the feeling of the originally-intended circle could become paramount, rather than the footprint of the Old Post Office. Exhibit D

E. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 25/OCT/90-4, Hirshhorn Museum, Independence Avenue at 7th and 9th streets, N.W. Plaza renovation, final paving and landscaping. (Previous: CFA 19/OCT/89-1.) Mr. Carson said this submission was for confirmation of the working drawings for the design seen in October 1989 and for review of a new lighting concept. He showed drawings of the approved plaza paving concept, with a circular area of granite in the center and precast pavers around it, and said that in the past year economic conditions and the practicality of attaching sculpture to paving had dictated certain changes, which would be discussed. He introduced Robert Dillman from the Smithsonian, landscape architect James Urban, and lighting engineer Claude Engle. Before asking Mr. Dillman to begin the presentation, he told the members he had attended a lighting mock-up in September, which Mr. Engle would discuss, and showed a nighttime photograph of the Hirshhorn, taken from the Old Post Office tower, before the lighting mock-up was in place. He noted that the building was scarcely visible.

Mr. Dillman was introduced, and he observed that both the Smithsonian projects on the agenda for this meeting addressed safety, security, and accessibility to Smithsonian buildings, items of major importance to the institution. He introduced James Urban, to talk about the architectural and landscape design proposals for the Hirshhorn.

Mr. Urban reviewed the project briefly for those members who were not familiar with it. He explained that the raised, cylindrical form of the building rested on a square, paved plaza on which sculpture was placed. The plaza formed the roof of part of the lower level of the museum and had developed serious leaks;

additionally, the paving was beginning to break up and was in constant need of repair. As the plaza material had to be taken up and the roof replaced, it was decided that the new plaza should be redesigned, with more landscaping and a better opportunity to display sculpture. He showed drawings of the scheme that had been approved in 1989: a circular area under the building, paved in granite, precast pavers sets in a radial pattern beyond, and then six sculpture "rooms", divided by plantings according to the radial geometry of the building, and tied together by a walk around the periphery of the square plaza. The rooms were landscaped with lawn areas for the sculpture, groups of shrubs, and trees. He noted that in building up the soil area around the perimeter to accommodate the trees, the outside wall had become too low on the east and west, and a hedge had been added to increase the height.

Turning to the paving, Mr. Urban said that because of the geometry--the inner and outer circles of the plaza were not concentric--each piece of paving in the entire job would be unique, and the center area of granite alone would cost half a million dollars. It was also realized that it would be hard to locate sculpture in the paved area because of the difficulty of attaching it to the paving, as then designed. He said the solution to these various problems had been to use poured-in-place concrete for the central circle, instead of granite, and a different, less expensive precast pattern for the larger circle. Both would have an exposed aggregate surface, and he thought the change from one kind of concrete to the other would not be noticeable because the central circle would usually be in shadow.

The members were not happy with the proposal. They thought the near-miss that would inevitably result from trying to match the two kinds of concrete would be disastrous, and they did not like the yellowish color of the exposed aggregate. Mr. Hartman said he considered concrete a poor paving material to use over a roof and in a situation where it would get heavy use from moving sculpture around; he said that was why it was deteriorating now and it would do it again in not too many years. He thought that if it could not be all granite, then the central circle should remain in that material and the most durable precast paver used in the larger area. The Chairman agreed, noting that the plaza was an important architectural space, an integral part of a building that had already suffered enough from being constructed of concrete when the architect had originally specified marble. He thought the money could be found to do it properly, if not from the government, then from the Smithsonian's private funds.

Mr. Urban said the original paving was all poured-in-place concrete, and most of the deterioration had occurred in the outer rings, where there were large areas with no expansion joints, not in the inner circle. He said that by not using granite in that area, money could be expended on getting the finest quality precast, one that would take more weight; by making this change

and using a different jointing pattern, plus making some adjustment in the grading, the problem of deterioration would be greatly diminished. Mr. Urban asked concrete expert George Dolby to join him in a discussion with the members on various paving possibilities. The director of the Hirshhorn Museum, James Demetrion, also took part in the discussion. It was agreed that if concrete were to be used, then a smooth finish, obtained by grinding, was preferable to the exposed aggregate finish; it was uncertain that this could be obtained in the large size precast pavers required, but it was not a problem for poured-in-place concrete.

There was also a discussion about the wall enclosing the plaza. Ms. Abrahamson said she found it forbidding, even if it was part of the design, and wished it could be removed so that the Smithsonian buildings, the trees, and the green of the Mall could be seen. Barring its removal, she thought it could at least be softened with planting. It was generally agreed that the wall was an essential part of the building and could not be removed, but Mr. Demetrion said they had been working, at the suggestion of the Planning Commission, on a planting scheme for the outside of the wall. Mr. Urban said vines had been planted in the past, but they did not have enough soil and were not doing well. He showed drawings with flowering trees, perennials and ground cover in planters so there would be adequate soil; he said NCPC thought the planting should have a gardenesque quality. Mr. Hartman said he disagreed completely; he thought that would be totally unsympathetic to the building. The Chairman thought the English cottage look should definitely be avoided. Vice-Chairman Porterfield suggested that wisteria growing over the top of the wall would be more suitable; he thought it important that the wall be clearly read from the outside. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor agreed, adding that it would be preferable to use just one kind of plant, rather than several.

Mr. Urban then introduced lighting engineer Claude Engle to discuss that part of the submission. Mr. Engle said the main purpose of the new lighting was increased security, and he observed that in taking visitors on nighttime tours of the monuments, he felt most secure in places where the light came from the building itself, for example, the Lincoln and Jefferson memorials. He said it had turned out to be quite simple to light the Hirshhorn that way, and the intensity of the light had been based on that used to light the East Building of the National Gallery of Art--9 to 12 footcandles, reflected measurement. He said the source would be PAR bulbs in discreetly designed bronze boxes recessed in the wall, and the lighting could be focused and thus "tuned" to get the most satisfactory result. He showed slides taken during the mock-up, noting the evenness of the lighting. Vice-Chairman Porterfield pointed out that some of the effectiveness of the reflected light would be lost when the plaza was landscaped; Mr. Urban said there would be supplemental lighting in the trees and a few corners,

where it was necessary. Mr. Peck was concerned that the lighting might cause the building to look like a flat plane rather than a curved surface; Mr. Engle said the light could be adjusted so that it was not even on both sides, and that would solve the problem. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor recalled that there had been attempts to come up with a master plan for lighting in the city and asked what the status of the plan was. She said she was particularly concerned about the color of the proposed lighting. The Chairman said there was a committee, and perhaps it should be reconvened now that there were new members on the Commission. Mr. Urban said members of that committee had been present at the lighting mock-up.

There was no further discussion, and the Chairman summarized the Commission's action on the several parts of this submission: the final plans for the landscaping of the plaza were approved, but the proposal for an informal, "cottage"-type planting along the exterior of the wall was not; it was strongly urged that money be found for using granite for the plaza paving, but the Commission would keep an open mind to the use of concrete along the lines suggested; the lighting approach was approved, with the request that the Commission see a mock-up. Exhibit E

2. CFA 25/OCT/90-5, Quadrangle repaving between Smithsonian Castle and Independence Avenue, N.W. Design. Mr. Martinez noted that the members had seen the site on their pre-meeting tour. He said the reason for requesting the change in paving was that the present crushed-stone surface was puddling during and after rains; it was posing difficulties for the handicapped and elderly; and the gritty material was being tracked into the museums and damaging the stone floors. He said the proposal was to replace the crushed stone with brick. He introduced Mark Kendall, the architect working on the project, to make the presentation.

Mr. Kendall showed photographs and drawings of existing conditions, pointed out the crushed-stone walks, the existing areas of brick, and the granite directly outside the two museums, the Sackler Gallery and the Museum of African Art. He noted also the lampposts with hanging flower displays, now placed within the walkways. He said the heavy foot traffic, wind and weather had produced an uneven surface along the walkways, causing the problems mentioned by Mr. Martinez. As there were areas of brick paving already existing, it was decided to redo the walks in that material, using a herringbone pattern rather than a running bond (as used in the existing areas) because it could be adapted to the curves and change in direction found in the walkways. There would be new catch basins to facilitate drainage. Mr. Kendall said changes were also being considered for better drainage in the fountain area at the Museum of African Art, to avoid the flooding that now existed, and for repaving a stone terrace with brick; he said this work would be submitted separately at a later date. He said the second change for which the Smithsonian was seeking

approval at this meeting was to move the lampposts from their present position within the walkways to a location outside, in the grass area immediately adjoining the walks.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield said he was very sorry to see the crushed stone go, because he thought it gave the garden a character not often seen in Washington; however, if the Smithsonian was convinced it was not working, then brick was the obvious answer. Mr. Hartman said he was happy to hear that a herringbone pattern would be used; in this way the problems encountered in the President's Park sidewalk proposal would not occur. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she was pleased that the lampposts would be moved; she said they had always looked strange placed within the walk. The Chairman agreed with the comments made, adding that in terms of priority, he suggested the Smithsonian might want to consider doing the Hirshhorn paving in the proper way this year, and then asking for money to redo the Quandrangle walks next year, based on the need for improved accessibility to the handicapped. Exhibit F
(The Chairman recessed the meeting at 12:45 p. m. for lunch; it was reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)

F. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

CFA 25/OCT/90-6, Metro Archives Station. Flood protection for ventilators. The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had seen this project on an informal basis in September and then had visited the site on their pre-meeting tour. He said the two ventilators had been a problem for Metro because during flash flood situations the water entered the grates and went into the 7th Street station. He introduced Emmanuel Mevorah from WMATA to discuss WMATA's proposed solution.

Mr. Mevorah explained that the problem involved two large shafts that ventilated the station, alleviated the piston action of the trains as they passed through, and were also a means of egress. Twice, during heavy rains, the station had to be closed and the water pumped out. To prevent the water from entering, WMATA was proposing to raise the sidewalk grates above the flood level; he said about one foot was needed, but to keep pedestrians from tripping over them, they were suggesting a seating height, about 30 inches. Recalling the Commission's previous suggestion that they be placed in the raised lawn area around the Archives building, thereby making them less conspicuous and not crowding the sidewalk, Mr. Mevorah said this would present a formidable task as the area was laced with utilities, including a six foot steam tunnel and two huge sewers. A discussion with Mr. Hartman did not produce any viable alternatives, and the Commission reluctantly agreed to approve WMATA's proposal, with the proviso that the structures be faced in granite, in harmony with the granite curbing separating the Archives lawn from the sidewalk. Vice-Chairman Porterfield and Ms. Chatfield-Taylor commented on the hodge-podge of "things" occurring on the city's sidewalks, particularly the

corners, in increasing numbers, noting that every underground facility had its above-ground manifestation. Exhibit G

G. Department of the Army, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers

1. CFA 25/OCT/90-7, Soldiers and Airmens Home, 3700 North Capitol Street, N.W. Renovation. Mr. Carson said this submission involved the infill of three courtyards in a 1950s dormitory building. He showed photographs and drawings, pointing out the one-story additions, which would house a bowling alley, a physical fitness center and a store. There were no objections, and the project was unanimously approved. Exhibit H

2. CFA 25/OCT/90-8, Magnetic Resonance Imaging Facility (MRI), Walter Reed Medical Center. Addition to existing hospital building. Revised design alternatives. (Previous: CFA 26/JUL/90-3, 21/JUN/90-6.) The Assistant Secretary noted that the members had visited the site; he showed a rendering of the mostly-underground facility from the pedestrian point of view, as requested by the Commission when the project was reviewed in July. The rendering showed a concrete wall with landscaping in front of it, adjoining an existing red brick hospital building. Mr. Myer also recalled that the Commission had asked to see the master plan for Walter Reed when it was available, and had a particular interest in which of the older structures would or would not be retained. He introduced Murray Geyer from Walter Reed, who in turn introduced architect George Anderson.

Mr. Anderson discussed the rendering, saying that the landscaping would consist primarily of flowering trees, about 20 feet high, and the concrete wall would be similar in finish to that on other buildings in the vicinity. He said the facility had presented a rather complicated design problem, because of the location of utilities and the level of corridors for patient access from the adjoining hospital; these considerations had dictated that some part of the building be above ground. Questions were asked about how long the adjoining hospital building would remain; Mr. Henley, the director of Walter Reed, said it was uncertain, that future plans were still in a state of flux. Mr. Peck commented that new construction seemed to be going in the direction of the recently-built main hospital, Building 2, a concrete structure; he did not think that was a wise decision and would prefer to see new work that was more sympathetic to the old, red brick, Georgian-style buildings.

The suggestion was made that the wall be faced with brick, so that it would look like a garden wall, part of the adjoining building; that vines be grown on it, and berming and other planting make it even less noticeable. Mr. Geyer said he saw no problem with that request, and the members then unanimously approved the project. Exhibit I

3. CFA 25/OCT/90-9, Walter Reed Medical Center. Landscape plan for multi-level parking structure. (Previous: CFA 19/SEP/90-3,CFA 15/NOV/89-2.) Mr. Martinez recalled the Commission's previous request that a different location for the basketball court be studied so that the landscaping area along Fern Street could be made deeper and the planting heavier. He said the staff had looked at the new drawings submitted and had not found much change; the court remained and the landscaping was basically the same except for the increase in caliper of some of the trees. He introduced Murray Geyer from Walter Reed, who said that Mr. Henley would address the basketball court problem, and landscape architect Beverly LeClaire would discuss the screening material.

Mr. Henley said there were about 600 young military personnel at Walter Reed; as the small campus was very short on physical recreation facilities, they needed to salvage what was left of the basketball court area. He said he realized the location was not ideal, but there was no other place to put the court. Ms. LeClaire commented on the Commission's previous suggestion that the green area shown on the edge of a drawing seen at the last meeting be looked at as a possible site; she said the drawing was misleading, that the green indicated only the narrow open space in front of the hospital building, which was not shown on the drawing.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield questioned Ms. LeClaire on the specific landscaping materials shown on the drawings. She said the hemlock trees were existing, and were 7-8 feet tall. She said she would underplant the hemlocks with groups of rhododendrons, because they would survive beneath the tree canopy and because they were used throughout the campus. She pointed out an area of rip-rap on a slope that would remain, because its removal would endanger two old catalpa trees. She said she was using Japanese black pine rather than white pine for screening material because it was more resistant to pollution. There would also be red oaks, which would relate to those used on the streets; Ms.LeClaire noted that the street trees on Fern Street would help in the screening, and she showed photographs of the campus from that street, pointing out the existing landscaping and her plans to augment it. She observed that no matter what size trees were added, it would still be possible to see the upper two floors of the parking structure. Mr. Geyer reminded the members that although the parking structure was five stories high, only three were above grade, and it would not be as intrusive as it seemed.

There was further discussion of the basketball and tennis courts, with Mr. Hartman suggesting that if they were really essential, they could be located on the roof of the parking structure; he did not think the loss of parking would be significant. Mr. Henley disagreed, saying that even the new facility would not make up for the shortfall in parking. He added that the night lighting would be disturbing to the Fern Street neighbors, but Mr. Hartman said the courts did not have to be

placed at that end of the building. Mr. Hartman was also concerned that the mature street trees would not survive the changes in the water table brought about by the new construction and the proximity of the playing surface of the courts.

Mr. Peck asked when the Commission would see the master plan; Mr. Henley said it would probably be a year and a half. The Chairman asked that the planners look carefully for other places to put the playing courts, because they were really unattractive jammed in next to the parking facility. Mr. Geyer said the master plan was just getting underway, and if in their studies they could find any other place to put the playing courts, they would certainly consider doing so. On that basis, the plans for the parking structure landscaping were unanimously approved. Exhibit J

H. The Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and the Virginia Railway Express

CFA 25/OCT/90-10, Station platform, Virginia Avenue and 7th Street, S.W. Design for new passenger facility. Mr. Carson said the members had seen the site on their pre-meeting tour, and he located it on an aerial photograph: on the railroad right-of-way at 7th Street and Virginia Avenue. He said the raised tracks would be reached by a covered stair and a ramp for the handicapped. He introduced Stephen Roberts from the Virginia Transportation Commission to explain the purpose of the proposed station, which was to provide a stop in central Washington on the way to Union Station from the Virginia suburbs.

Mr. Roberts first showed color renderings of the Virginia Railway Express logo, the system colors, and the type of locomotive that would be seen in the station. He said this would be the most important station in the system--it would be within walking distance of 30,000 jobs. He said the first choice for a site had been the new Aerospace building, and although the developer was agreeable, Conrail was not, saying they wanted only straight-through traffic at that location. (The trains would operate on Conrail tracks and use their right-of-way.) The site at 7th Street and Virginia Avenue was worked out with Conrail to everyone's satisfaction. Mr. Roberts showed renderings of the proposed station, noting that a handicapped ramp was being used instead of an elevator because of both mechanical and aesthetic problems. He also showed renderings of suburban stations, noting that they were not all the same color. Green was proposed for the station under discussion. In answer to the Chairman's question, Mr. Roberts said the trains would operate during rush hours between Fredericksburg and Washington, and Masassas and Washington. There were no further objections or questions, and the station platform design was unanimously approved. Exhibit K

I. Department of the Army, Institute of Heraldry

CFA 25/OCT/90-12, Maritime Administration; seven medal designs. Mrs. Kohler explained that these medals were for the Merchant Marine, that they had been authorized some time ago, some as far back as World War II, and although the recipients had received their ribbons, the medals had never been struck. They were for: Atlantic War Zone, Pacific War Zone, Korean War Zone, Vietnam War Zone, Merchant Marine Expeditionary Award, Merchant Marine Defense, and Mediterranean Middle Eastern War Zone. Mrs. Kohler showed the designs, noting that the reverse, in all cases, was based on the seal of the Maritime Administration. The members were pleased with the designs and unanimously approved them, the only comment being that the "bamboo-style" lettering on the obverse of the Vietnam medal lacked dignity and another style should be used that was consonant with that on the reverse. Exhibit L

J. Navy Memorial Foundation

CFA 25/OCT/90-13, Bas-reliefs for Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N.W. (Previous: CFA 19/SEP/90-2, CFA 15/FEB/90-1, CFA 20/APR/89-4, CFA 19/MAY/88-1.) Mrs. Kohler introduced Captain Bob Jones from the Navy Memorial Foundation, and Leo Irrera, the sculptor/coordinator for the project. Captain Jones said he would show concept designs for two new bas-reliefs and revised designs for two others previously seen by the Commission. The first new design, "John Paul Jones", showed a deck scene on the Ranger with Jones in command. It was in sketch form, ink on paper, approximately full scale. The members were concerned that it might be too busy and suggested that reducing the number of people by one or two might make a stronger design. The second new concept was for "Naval Airships". It, too, was a sketch on paper and showed a back view of the pilot and copilot in the cockpit of an airship. He said it was in a very preliminary stage and the rendering of the wheel and instrument panel would be more fully developed, as would the figures. The design was a simple one, and the members were pleased with it.

Captain Jones then showed two revised designs. The first was for the "Seabees" panel. He recalled that the Commission had asked that the bulldozer be reduced in size and the figure in the foreground be more involved in the action. The members thought the design improved, but still had some questions for the sculptor, Mr. Irrera, about the foreground figure. Mr. Irrera explained further changes he was planning to make. The second revised design was for the "Naval Academy" panel. Following the members' suggestions, the center of the panel had been considerably simplified. Captain Jones said the sculptor was also planning to curve the line of midshipmen slightly so that they were not so stiff, but the Chairman was concerned that this would diminish the sense of discipline and precision, so important in the conception of the Naval Academy, and lacking in the other figures portrayed.

Captain Jones thanked the members for their suggestions; it was expected that he would return with photographs of the clay models when ready. Exhibit M

K. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Appendix I. The appendix was approved without objection.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 90-106, 1263-65 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Commercial underground addition. Revised concept. (Previous: 19/SEP/90, 17/MAY/90.) (Mr. Hartman left the meeting at this point.) The Assistant Secretary explained the change in grade on this lot which made possible the extension of the ground floor streetfront space to become underground space in the rear, below an existing parking lot, which would remain. He pointed this out on a model. He said the Georgetown Board's report to the Commission recommended that the addition be reduced in size to 550 square feet and all above-grade aspects be clearly shown prior to any approval being granted. He showed a drawing which reflected progress that had been made since that report, pointing put specifically a covered entrance from the new space to the surface. He added that there could be other visible elements--mechanical equipment or vents--that would need to be looked at carefully because of the impact they might have on the historic district. Another recommendation made by the Board was that the addition be designed to allow for a tree planting area, a recommendation previously made for a property along the C & O Canal. He noted that the applicant and his representative were present, as well as the ANC representative, and that a letter had been received from the Citizens Association of Georgetown. Carolyn Brown, an architectural historian from the law firm of Wilkes & Artis, representing the applicant/owner, was introduced.

Ms. Brown first asked where the 550 square foot figure had come from. When Mr. Carson said it represented what would be allowed under 60 percent lot occupancy, the standard zoning number, Ms. Brown said she did not believe that applied to underground additions. She added that the applicant's needs would not be served by a 40% reduction; she said he needed the full 1300 square feet he was proposing for storage purposes. She showed the new drawings, noting that the stair had been approved by the District government, and saying that the air-conditioning units were those already existing, and there would be no vents. The Assistant Secretary said the Board would expect to see the changes and make recommendations.

There was a discussion among the members and the Assistant Secretary about visibility--he said the new elements would be visible from the alley only--and the condition and character of the rear of other structures on the alley. The Assistant Secretary said the appearance of the alley was not uniform, that the buildings were all rather small structures, used exclusively for retail or commercial purposes, and many of them had rear wings, garages, etc. Mr. Peck said there was no question that back yards and open space and trees were part of the character of Georgetown, but in this commercial area, he did not think there was much opportunity for providing a tree canopy in the rear, and he wasn't sure that it was wise to expect this one property to provide it for the whole block. He thought it would be nice if they could get some landscaping in, but he did not think it was of major importance in this location. Mr. Porterfield asked if there were any existing trees in the space; Ms. Brown said it was just a paved parking lot.

The Chairman then asked ANC representative Kara Kent for her comments. She said she saw the building of underground additions as a last resort for merchants unable to increase their space by going either up or back, and she said she would not be surprised if the law firm, in this case, had taken it on to establish a precedent for other property owners. She said the community would take the case as far as necessary to be sure that it did not establish a precedent, and she saw approval by the Commission as having the most serious consequences for the historic district. Secondly, she said that statements during the Georgetown Board meeting by members Vytlacil and Andrews, indicating their opposition to underground additions, were in direct conflict with the language of the Board's report. She also asked where the 550 square foot figure had come from; she said it had not come up during the public meeting. Ms. Kent said the ANC had never reviewed the project because the Board had seemed so adamantly against it each time it was reviewed.

Mr. Peck said he had a problem with extending the Commission's jurisdiction to underground construction, and he thought that was something that should be explored from a legal point of view. He asked Ms. Kent why she thought underground additions were so damaging to Georgetown. She said it was because they could endanger the foundations of the buildings, and because the volume of usable space was increased; in the case of a business such as a bar, it would mean more seats that could be bought with a liquor license. Mr. Peck said he thought she had a legimitate concern, but it was more of a zoning issue than an aesthetic issue. Ms. Kent said the zoning administrator had told her this kind of underground space did not count in zoning calculations. Mr. Peck said in that case she had a zoning problem; Ms. Kent said the problem rested with the Commission and its mandate to preserving the historic district as a whole. Mr. Peck said his reading of the legislation was that the Commission was to preserve the appearance

There was a discussion among the members and the Assistant Secretary about visibility--he said the new elements would be visible from the alley only--and the condition and character of the rear of other structures on the alley. The Assistant Secretary said the appearance of the alley was not uniform, that the buildings were all rather small structures, used exclusively for retail or commercial purposes, and many of them had rear wings, garages, etc. Mr. Peck said there was no question that back yards and open space and trees were part of the character of Georgetown, but in this commercial area, he did not think there was much opportunity for providing a tree canopy in the rear, and he wasn't sure that it was wise to expect this one property to provide it for the whole block. He thought it would be nice if they could get some landscaping in, but he did not think it was of major importance in this location. Mr. Porterfield asked if there were any existing trees in the space; Ms. Brown said it was just a paved parking lot.

The Chairman then asked ANC representative Kara Kent for her comments. She said she saw the building of underground additions as a last resort for merchants unable to increase their space by going either up or back, and she said she would not be surprised if the law firm, in this case, had taken it on to establish a precedent for other property owners. She said the community would take the case as far as necessary to be sure that it did not establish a precedent, and she saw approval by the Commission as having the most serious consequences for the historic district. Secondly, she said that statements during the Georgetown Board meeting by members Vytlacil and Andrews, indicating their opposition to underground additions, were in direct conflict with the language of the Board's report. She also asked where the 550 square foot figure had come from; she said it had not come up during the public meeting. Ms. Kent said the ANC had never reviewed the project because the Board had seemed so adamantly against it each time it was reviewed.

Mr. Peck said he had a problem with extending the Commission's jurisdiction to underground construction, and he thought that was something that should be explored from a legal point of view. He asked Ms. Kent why she thought underground additions were so damaging to Georgetown. She said it was because they could endanger the foundations of the buildings, and because the volume of usable space was increased; in the case of a business such as a bar, it would mean more seats that could be bought with a liquor license. Mr. Peck said he thought she had a legimitate concern, but it was more of a zoning issue than an aesthetic issue. Ms. Kent said the zoning administrator had told her this kind of underground space did not count in zoning calculations. Mr. Peck said in that case she had a zoning problem; Ms. Kent said the problem rested with the Commission and its mandate to preserving the historic district as a whole. Mr. Peck said his reading of the legislation was that the Commission was to preserve the appearance

of Georgetown, not the way it operated. Vice-Chairman Porterfield thought the Commission's mandate was to protect the visual quality and character of the district, and as far as the immediate future was concerned, he did not think this addition would affect that in a negative way. What would happen farther down the road--perhaps twenty or forty years--remained a big question, and he did not think this was a pivotal case in finding the answer.

Ms. Kent asked that the ANC be given the opportunity to hear the case and that the Commission seriously consider requiring the applicant to provide for a tree or trees in the ground, not in planters; this would at least limit the amount of underground burrowing. Vice-Chairman Porterfield agreed this was something the Commission could do, since the trees of Georgetown affected the skyline, and that was part of the visual experience. Ms. Abrahamson said she could understand what Ms. Kent was saying about the results of too much underground construction, but she thought the Commission would have to consider the applications on a case-by-case basis; the Chairman agreed, saying that had been the Commission's usual policy. He also agreed with Vice-Chairman Porterfield's suggestion about the tree-planting requirement.

There was a discussion about referring the project to the ANC and/or sending it back to the Georgetown Board before a decision was made; the consensus was that the additional time required would be a hardship on the applicant, and it was already reasonably sure what the decisions of both bodies would be. Therefore, a motion was made to approve the addition as shown on the supplemental drawings seen by the Commission, subject to the recommendations of the Georgetown Board, except that the size would not be limited to 550 square feet, but to the extent that would allow a side planting area with a minimum width of 5 feet clear space and the planting of two 6 inch caliper trees. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she would rather not vote for approval, but saw no way to oppose it. Ms. Abrahamson agreed there was no visual impact involved other than the tree canopy. The motion was carried unanimously. Exhibit N

Ms. Kent returned to a discussion of the discrepancy between what was said at the Georgetown Board meeting and what appeared in the report the Board sent to the Commission; she said this was not the first time it had happened. The Secretary said the reports were sent to the Board members for their approval, and were initialed, and often there was considerable discussion before they were finally approved. Ms. Kent said this made for a very confusing situation as far as the public was concerned. The Chairman thanked Ms. Kent for pointing this out and said the problem would be referred to the staff.

b. Appendix II. The Appendix was approved without objection.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

5 November 1990

Dear Mrs. Pope:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with Mr. Eugene Essner during its 25 October 1990 meeting to review designs for coins commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial.

Specifically, the Commission noted that in every case, the lettering on obverse and reverse should conform. Otherwise, the Commission was pleased with the design for the five dollar gold coin and approved it. The members had several recommendations regarding the other coins, as follows:

One Dollar Silver Coin

Obverse: It was quite apparent that the two sides of this coin were designed by different artists, and it was thought that the lettering on the obverse should be closer in style to that on the reverse, especially the line that reads: "Mount Rushmore National Memorial Golden Anniversary".

Reverse: It was recommended that the Great Seal be the central element, the map eliminated, and the words "National Shrine" be changed to "Shrine of Democracy".

Half-Dollar Clad Coin

Obverse: This was considered the weakest design in the group. The placing of the Mount Rushmore heads within the map of the United States does not work well, and the appearance of Alaska and Hawaii dangling in space is not acceptable. In reviewing the other competition entries, the members though number J-1 was a stronger design; the heads are seen in a more pleasing perspective and are not encumbered by another design element.

Reverse: The words "50th Year Anniversary" crowd the space and would be better removed, giving more prominence to the bison who, it is hoped, will have a stronger, less scraggly appearance when sculpted. The reference to Mount Rushmore's fiftieth anniversary already appears on the obverse design presented, but if obverse J-1 is used, the anniversary notation could be incorporated into the design, perhaps just by the use of the two dates, 1941-1991. It was noted also, in regard to the design for the reverse, the "E" in "E Pluribus Unum" is not an abbreviation and should not be followed by a period.

We realize that the Mint is working on a tight schedule, and as the Commission will not meet again until December, we suggested to Mr. Essner that he work with the staff in implementing the above recommendations.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Donna Pope, Director
United States Mint
633 3rd Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on 25 October 1990, reviewed and approved concept designs for the new chancery of Singapore at the International Center. Because of its gateway location at the corner of Van Ness Street and International Drive East, N.W., the building and landscape proposals are particularly appropriate and will represent the government of Singapore with considerable distinction. The Commission looks forward to working with you as the designs and material selection evolve.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Herbert W. Johnson
Project Manager
International Center Project
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

5 November 1990

Dear Ms. Reiter:

During its meeting of 25 October 1990, the Commission reviewed sidewalk paving studies for the White House Precinct with special emphasis on several of the vehicular and pedestrian intersections in the area bounded by Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues and 15th and 17th Streets. The members commend the progress of current work along Pennsylvania Avenue and encourage the same effort and spirit throughout the remainder of the "President's Park". With this in mind, the Commission has several suggestions that should improve the overall concept as it develops.

Prior to the meeting, a tour of the precinct with Carol Whipple confirmed the asymmetry of the site, in particular the significant differences in sidewalk widths, changes in elevation, and profusion of utility structures. While the members continue to encourage use of the same family of materials for curbs, pavement and crosswalks, the detailing and proportioning of those elements must complement the existing geometries and conditions. As such, the members discourage the use of granite banding as a device to gloss over awkward angles and differing sidewalk widths. Cutting the pavers to curve and flow with each change in direction would provide instead a series of elegant transitions. This type of detailing is quite feasible.

Although the presentation addressed the periphery of the White House Precinct, the Commission is equally concerned about the treatment of the secondary and tertiary walks within the park, and looks forward to seeing how these walks will be accommodated in the overall scheme. Removing some of the surface parking should be an important consideration. This is especially true of Treasury Place where the visual and

pedestrian axis between the Hamilton and Sherman statues should be strengthened rather than given over to parking as is currently the case.

The Commission looks forward to working with you over the long term and offers the help of its staff as questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Mary E. Reiter
Acting Associate Regional Director
White House Liaison
National Park Service
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Crichlow:

The Commission was delighted to see Mr. Karn's designs for completing the IRS Building on 25 October 1990. We are pleased that GSA is able to undertake this project and feel the proposals resolve a difficult design dilemma. Though several refinements were discussed, we are approving the designs with enthusiasm.

After careful study the Commission feels that the restraint shown on the 11th Street facade is appropriate. The new work should neither compete with the existing IRS Building or the Old Post Office. It would be especially inappropriate to attempt to reproduce the three-dimensional qualities of the 10th Street facade. A minor matter is elimination of the horizontal trim between the principal 12th Street facade and the court facade, in the notch between them. This will result in a cleaner articulation of these two elements.

The Commission appreciates your efforts and is eager to see the project move forward. The incomplete ends of this building have been eyesores long enough.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Crichlow
General Services Administration
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20407

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

5 November 1990

EXHIBIT E

Dear Mr. Dillman:

During its meeting of 25 October 1990, the Commission reviewed final drawings for the renovation of the Hirshhorn Museum terrace. The original concept was approved during the Commission meeting held in October 1989. The members note that changes have occurred in the interim, the most significant of these changes being the paving. To the members' regret, less costly poured-in-place concrete has been substituted for the granite originally intended for the center panel. The same rough aggregate finish proposed for the precast pavers of the outer terrace would be echoed in the center and scored to simulate actual pavers. This is not acceptable. In reality, the two surfaces, though nominally the same material, would differ just enough to be noticeable: a near miss, if you will, which would be a very disturbing anomaly.

The members' disappointment is not limited to the loss of the granite alone. The exposed aggregate as submitted is itself inappropriate. In this respect, the problem may be color as well as texture. The current (and proposed) yellowish tones do not relate either to the existing building surfaces or to the proposed grey granite curbing.

As for the remaining portion of the submission, the members feel that the landscape architect has the correct solution. The Commission notes, however, the imposition of additional landscape material at the outside of the terrace walls framing the entrances from the Mall and Independence Avenue. Adding a bit of greenery is certainly commendable, but the members believe that such a scheme should reflect the character of the building and its monumental setting. Rather than a "gardenesque" look, which is totally out of character with the building, the plant selection should enhance and take its form from the architecture; wisteria comes to mind.

Lastly, the Commission would like to touch on the subject of lighting. In general, the members are pleased with the proposed scheme but caution against applying a uniform intensity of light which could "bleach out" the three-dimensional form of the building. Dimming the illumination from the west would result in a pleasing accent of the surface.

The members look forward to a final review of this important project and offer the assistance of the staff as questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Robert P. Dillman, P.E.
Director
Office of Design and Construction
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Dillman:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its 25 October 1990 meeting, had the opportunity to review and approve the proposed alterations to the Enid A. Haupt Garden at the Quadrangle adjacent to the Smithsonian Castle.

We regret the ensuing loss of the Victorian character of the garden, but realize the existing gravel surface has drainage problems, limits accessibility for the elderly and handicapped, and is causing damage to the floors of the pavilions. Fortunately, the proposed herringbone pattern brick paving is an acceptable substitute that will unify the walkways with the pavilion courts. The relocation of the lampposts off the walks is a decided improvement.

At the meeting it was mooted that if there were a budgetary constriction in the coming year, perhaps the use of appropriately durable materials for the Hirshhorn deck might be a higher priority.

We take this opportunity to extend a warm welcome to you as you take on the Smithsonian Institution's design programs. As always, we are available to help you in any way we can.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Robert P. Dillman, P.E.
Director
Office of Design and Construction
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT G

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Tucker:

The Commission met with Emanuel Mevorah on 25 October 1990 to discuss flood protection for the Metro Archives Station. The proposal to raise the vent grilles thirty inches with granite facing is reluctantly approved. Because these vent boxes will be an unwelcome addition to Constitution Avenue and the foreground of the National Archives Building, we hope alternate means of protecting the station will continue to be explored. Hopefully the storm sewer along Constitution Avenue can be upgraded in the future and these boxes can be removed.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Tracy C. Tucker, Director
Office of Engineering and Architecture
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit
Authority
600 Fifth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT H

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

During its meeting of 25 October 1990, the Commission reviewed and approved designs for additions to the Sheridan dormitory building at the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home off North Capitol Street. The members commend the thoughtful treatment of the proposed low infill structures and believe they will fit in well with the existing building. In approving this submission, the Commission recommends incorporation of landscape screening, preferably evergreen, along the east side which faces North Capitol Street.

As always, the Commission enjoys working with you and offers the services of the staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard C. Armstrong
Acting Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Military Programs
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT I

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

The Commission appreciated the additional renderings supporting the design for Walter Reed's new MRI facility. The drawings allay our fears about the structure's potential visibility, but make the need for a brick finish on all exterior walls compelling. The relationship to both the adjacent 1-D Building and efforts at future enhancement of the older campus of the same material will benefit. As the new master plan is prepared, we hope that the traditional buildings and curving, tree-lined streets will set the tone. Treating the new MRI building as a brick landscaped garden wall is a good step in that direction.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard C. Armstrong
Acting Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Military Programs
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT J

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

During its meeting on 25 October 1990 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed and approved revised landscape plans for the new parking structure at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. The number and increased size of the proposed new trees, and the higher elevation of Fern Street and its adjacent sidewalk contributes to the goal of screening the parking structure and athletic courts from the periphery of the post. Additional screening and another location for the courts should be included in the current master planning effort.

The Commission looks forward to reviewing this campus-wide plan in the near future. In the meantime, we are happy to offer our assistance throughout the planning process.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard C. Armstrong
Acting Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Military Programs
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT K

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Roberts:

During its meeting of 25 October 1990, the Commission reviewed and approved plans for a railway station at Virginia Avenue and 7th Street, Southwest. The members are delighted with the proposed design. They believe that the suburban rail aesthetic of light metal shelters over the platforms with virtually no interior structures strikes a most appropriate note and provides a nice contrast with the relatively monumental metro system.

In this regard the success of the design is quite dependent on the consistency of the execution of detail and manufacturing processes, and a lapse in either area could substantially diminish the quality of the finished product. The same is equally true of graphics and lighting. Therefore strict controls will be necessary in the final design and fabrication steps.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Steven T. Roberts
Northern Virginia
Transportation Commission
4350 North Fairfax Drive
Suite 720
Arlington, VA 22203

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT L

5 November 1990

Dear Mr. Luchino:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for seven medals for the United States Maritime Service at its meeting on 25 October 1990. The Commission approved the medals, the only recommendation being that the lettering style on the obverse of the Vietnam Service Medal be changed so that it is consonant with that on the reverse. There was no objection to the lettering styles used on the other obverse designs.

The members have asked me to compliment you and your staff on the excellence of all the designs submitted.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Gerald R. Luchino,
Acting Director
The Institute of Heraldry
United States Army
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22304-5050

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N W, SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT M

8 November 1990

Dear Captain Jones:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with you and sculptor Leo Irrera at its 25 October meeting to review conceptual designs for two more bas-reliefs for the Navy Memorial: "Naval Airships" and "John Paul Jones - RANGER/DRAKE". The members approved the concepts, although they had several recommendations. They found the "John Paul Jones" design successful, if a bit confusing, and thought it would benefit if one or more of the figures could be taken out. Realizing the "Naval Airships" design was a first sketch, they admired its simplicity and looked forward to seeing it again when it was more fully developed and detailed.

The revised design shown for the "Naval Academy" panel was considered an improvement; it, too, had been somewhat confusing because of the number of figures included. The members thought it important to retain the feeling of precision and discipline in the depiction of the marching midshipmen. The revised design for the "Seabees" was also considered improved, although there was question about the stance of the figure holding the rifle, which the artist will be restudying.

The staff will be pleased to review the clay models when ready. The Commission will expect to see the photographs of the artists' developed version, before casting takes place.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert S. Jones
Captain, U. S. Navy (Ret.)
United States Navy
Memorial Foundation
Box 12728
Arlington, VA 22209-8728

EXHIBIT N

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

25 October 1990

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-106 HPA. 90-453	1263-65 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Parviz Mizrahi Commercial	Underground addition - revised concept

ACTION: No objection to revised concept for smaller addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 25 October 1990 provided all above-grade construction details are included in working drawings and side planting area has a minimum width of five feet and two six-inch caliper hardwood shade trees are planted as part of project. An eighteen-inch high curb shall be provided to protect planting areas.